



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/919,457 | 07/30/2001 | Michael Luther | PW 053403 272577 | 3563 |

7590 11/05/2003
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Intellectual Property Group
50 Fremont Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER

BACKER, FIRMIN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 3621 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,457

Applicant(s)

LUTHER ET AL.

Examiner

Firmin Backer

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to a letter for patent filed on July 30th, 2001 in which claims 1-39 are presented for examination. Claims 1-39 are pending in the letter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 8-12, 15, 16, 25-29, 32-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawata et al (U.S. PG Pub No 2002/0032777).

3. As per claims 8, Kawata et al teach a data transmission load management system (*load balancing system, fig 1*) comprising a plurality of data processors (*client 105, server 107, 108, 109*) and a load manager (*load balancer, 100*) operative to distribute incoming data (*service request packet*) to a selected one of the plurality of data processors (*server, 107, 108, 109*) in accordance with a current data transmission load capacity (*load status*) at each of the plurality of

Art Unit: 3621

data processors and further in accordance with a network transaction (*load sharing*) with which the data packet is associated (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

4. As per claims 9, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager is provided with a network address representative of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

5. As per claims 10, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager is a computer server (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

6. As per claims 11, Kawata et al teach a system wherein each of the plurality of data processors is an independent computer server (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

7. As per claims 12, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager comprises a hash function providing output associated with the incoming data in accordance with the network transaction (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

8. As per claims 15, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager receives load capacity signals from each of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

9. As per claims 16, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager distributes the incoming data responsive to the load capacity signals and the output (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

10. As per claims 25, Kawata et al teach a data transmission load management system (*load balancing system, fig 1*) for use in a packet-switched communications network (*network, 106*) comprising: a plurality of data processors (*client 105, server 107, 108, 109*) and a load manager (*load balancer, 100*) operative to distribute an incoming data packet (*service request packet*) to a selected one of the plurality of data processors (*server, 107, 108, 109*) the load manager comprising: load determining means (*server load estimation processing, 101*) for determining (*estimating*) current data transmission load capacity (*load status*) at each of the plurality of data processors transaction identifying means (*server selection processing*) for identifying a network transaction (*load sharing*) with which the data packet is associated and data distribution means for distributing an incoming data packet to a selected one of the plurality of data processors responsive to the load determining means and the transaction identification means (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

11. As per claims 26, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager is provided with a network address representative of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

12. As per claims 27, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load determining means is responsive to load capacity signals from each of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

13. As per claims 28, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the transaction identifying means is responsive to a transaction identification value associated with the data packet (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

14. As per claims 29, Kawata et al teach a system wherein the load manager distributes every data packet having a particular transaction identification value to a selected one of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

15. As per claims 32, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network (*network, 106*) comprising: a plurality of data processors (*client 105, server 107, 108, 109*); each of the plurality of data processors having processing capacity, executing data transmission processing tasks (*load balancing, 100*), and forwarding data packets (*service request packet*) to one or more intended recipients (*server, 107, 108, 109*); and a load manager (*load balancer, 100*); the load manager operative to identify a network transaction (*load sharing*) with which transmitted data packets are associated, to receive signals from each of the plurality of data processors related to the processing capacity (*load status*), and to distribute the data packets to a selected one of the plurality of data processors in accordance with the processing capacity and

Art Unit: 3621

further in accordance with the network transaction (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

16. As per claims 33, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network wherein the load manager is provided with a network address representative of the plurality of data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

17. As per claims 34, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network wherein the load manager is a computer server (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

18. As per claims 35, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network wherein each of the plurality of data processors is an independent computer server (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

19. As per claims 36, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network wherein the load manager comprises a hash function providing output for each of the transmitted data packets in accordance with the network transaction (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

20. As per claims 39, Kawata et al teach a packet-switched data communication network wherein the load manager distributes the every data packet associated with a particular network

Art Unit: 3621

transaction to a selected one of the data processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 1-7, 13, 14, 17-24, 30, 31, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0032777) in view of Bhat et al (PG Pub. 2003/0037093).

23. As per claims 1 and 17, Kawata et al teach a method of managing a data transmission load (*load balancing system, fig 1*) in a communication network (*network, 106*) the method comprising: receiving transmitted data (*service request packet*) at a data transmission load manager (*load balancer, 100*); determining a current data transmission load capacity (*load status*) at each of a plurality of data communication processors (*server, 107, 108, 109*); identifying a network transaction (*service request packet*) to which the transmitted data is related; and distributing the transmitted data to a selected one of the plurality of data communication processors in accordance with the determining and the executing (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*). Kawata et al fail to teach an inventive concept of executing

Art Unit: 3621

a hash function in accordance with the identifying. However, Bhat et al teach an inventive concept of executing a hash function in accordance with the identifying (*see fig 2, paragraphs 0022, 0023, 0028, 0029*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawata et al's inventive concept to include Bhat et al's executing a hash function in accordance with the identifying because this would have ensure that the selection of the processors balancing load is done fairly and according to load capacity thereby enhance the flexibility of the system.

24. As per claims 2 and 18, Kawata et al teach a method wherein the receiving includes providing the data transmission load manager with a network address representative of the plurality of data communication processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

25. As per claims 3 and 19, Kawata et al teach a method wherein the identifying includes examining the transmitted data to ascertain an intended recipient (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

26. As per claims 4 and 20, Kawata et al teach a method wherein the examining includes determining a transaction identification value associated with the transmitted data (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

27. As per claims 5, 13, 14, 22, 30, 31, 37 and 38, Kawata et al fail to teach providing results of the executing to a modulo function and computing a modulo value representative of one of the

Art Unit: 3621

plurality of data communication processors; wherein the distributing is further in accordance with the computing. However, Bhat et al teach a method further comprising: providing results of the executing to a modulo function and computing a modulo value representative of one of the plurality of data communication processors; wherein the distributing is further in accordance with the computing (*see paragraphs 0037, 0043, 0057*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawata et al's inventive concept to include Bhat et al's inventive of providing results of the executing to a modulo function and computing a modulo value representative of one of the plurality of data communication processors; wherein the distributing is further in accordance with the computing concept because this would have ensure that the selection of the processors balancing load is done fairly and according to load capacity thereby enhance the flexibility of the system.

28. As per claims 6 and 21, Kawata et al teach a method wherein the determining includes accepting, at the data transmission load manager, one or more load status signals from each of the plurality of data communication processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

29. As per claims 7 and 23, Kawata et al teach a method wherein the distributing is responsive to the transaction identification value and the one or more load status signals (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).

30. As per claim 24, Kawata et al teach a computer readable medium further encoded with data and instructions, further causing an apparatus to analyze each the load status signal to

Art Unit: 3621

determine relative residual processing capacity for each of the plurality of data communication processors (*see fig 1, paragraphs 0005-0010, 0037-0042*).


Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (*see form 892*).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firmin Backer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.


Firmin Backer
Examiner
Art Unit 3621

October 29, 2003